

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
10

11 JOYCE ANN MURRELL,

No. CIV S-10-0367-JAM-CMK

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

ORDER

14 WALTER THEILER, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/

17 Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, brings this civil action. For cases such as this,  
18 which are based on federal question jurisdiction, the federal venue statute requires that the action  
19 be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants reside in  
20 the same State, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving  
21 rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is  
22 situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in  
23 which the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). Here, it appears that a  
24 substantial part of the events giving rise to the instant action occurred in Santa Barbara,  
25 California, which is within the boundaries of the United States District Court for the Central  
26 ///

1 District of California.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the court finds that this action most appropriately proceeds in  
2 that district. In the interest of justice, the court will transfer this case. See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter, along with all pending  
4 motions and/or requests, is transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District  
5 of California.

6  
7 DATED: April 7, 2010

8   
9 **CRAIG M. KELLISON**  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>1</sup> This court may take judicial notice of state court records, see Kasey v.  
25 Molybdenum Corp. of America, 336 F.2d 560, 563 (9th Cir. 1964), as well as its own records,  
26 see Chandler v. U.S., 378 F.2d 906, 909 (9th Cir. 1967). Plaintiff filed an action in this court on  
January 27, 2009, on a nearly identical complaint. See case no. CIV-S-09-0234-MCE-KJM.  
That action was transferred to the Central District on April 30, 2009.